



LAWRENCE S. KRASNER
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
THREE SOUTH PENN SQUARE
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3499
215-686-8000

May 6, 2022

The Honorable Pamela A. Carlos
United States Magistrate Judge
4006 United States Courthouse
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

RE: *Harold Staten v Kevin Ransom, et al.*
Civil Action No. 20-4454

Dear Judge Carlos:

Pursuant to the Court's order, ECF No. 13, respondents write regarding the status of petitioner Harold Staten's pending state court proceedings. Petitioner's federal proceedings are stayed pending the conclusion of the PCRA proceedings. Defense counsel filed Mr. Staten's PCRA petition on his behalf June 9, 2020. The Court has continued Mr. Staten's PCRA proceedings several times due to scheduling conflicts and voluntary discovery. On April 28, 2022, Judge Scott DiClaudio continued Mr. Staten's PCRA proceedings to allow for voluntary discovery and listed the next status hearing for June 23, 2022. (*See* CP-51-CR-0434111-1986).

Please let me know if you require any additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew Stiegler

Matthew Stiegler

Supervisor, Federal Litigation Unit

cc: Harold Staten, *pro se*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 6, 2022, a copy of the foregoing was served on petitioner via first-class mail at the following address:

Smart Communications/PA DOC¹
Harold Staten/#AS-2651
SCI Dallas
P.O. Box 33028
St. Petersburg, FL 33733

/s/ Matthew Stiegler
Matthew Stiegler

¹ The respondents are required by Pennsylvania Department of Corrections policy to mail this to the petitioner using the Smart Communications address. The applicable policy provides, "all incoming inmate mail (other than privileged) must be send to the Department's contracted incoming inmate mail processor," which is Smart Communications. *See* Pa. DOC, DC-ADM 803, section 1 (C)(1). Respondents' legal filings are not "privileged," because counsel for the respondents do not represent the petitioner or have any other relationship with the petitioner that would make their communications privileged. Therefore, the respondents are prohibited by the DOC's policy from mailing documents directly to the petitioner at the address of the prison where the petitioner is in custody.